Inside this issue:

- **Venezuela: Our Take**
- **After Venezuela, Who's Next?**
- **VENEZUELA: Thousands of Cuban Communists Propped Up Maduro, Continue Shielding Regime**
- **Bolsonaro: Maduro Capture Is a Severe Blow to São Paulo Forum in Latin America**
- **Massie Sounds the Alarm on Minnesota Childcare Fraud, Venezuelan Intervention, and NATO**
- **Illinois Appropriates $1 Million to "Reimagine Capitalism"**
- **Trump Administration Cuts Federal Regulations in 2025**
- **DHS Admits REAL ID Unreliable for Verifying Citizenship**
- **Eliminate Waste in the Federal Childcare Program? Why not End the Program Entirely?**
- **Warm Collectivism? Talk About an Oxymoron!**
- **NYMHM: News You May Have Missed**

Venezuela: Our Take

The new year is barely a week old, and already, the affairs of the nations have been roiled by the dramatic military action in Venezuela, which, like so many of Trump's actions, has generated conflicting opinions among those on the so-called Right. On the one hand, the constitutionality of even an extremely limited military action to capture the president of another country is dubious at best. On the other, the fact that Venezuela has become a lynchpin of communist expansion in the Western Hemisphere and has engaged in systematic activities hostile to the United States is self-evident. Venezuela, which has been ruled by Marxist dictators for almost three decades, fell victim to the bacillus of Marxism as a result of the United States allowing, and even encouraging, that bacillus to first contaminate Cuba almost 70 years ago. Yet at the time of this writing, the Marxists still run Venezuela, and continue to round up protestors and journalists apace — even as Trump insists the United States is in control and is pushing the new Marxist vice president toward a transition.

Then there is the oil, which Trump has repeatedly and openly touted in public appearances since the U.S. military action. There can be no question that the United States stands to benefit from renewed and unfettered access to Venezuelan oil — access that was quite literally stolen back in 2007 without compensation. Yet, as one Venezuelan man pointed out sardonically in a viral interview, "those who say that the U.S. is only interested in our oil, I ask you: What do you think the Russians and the Chinese wanted here? The recipe for arepas?" Finally, there is the public reaction to the Venezuelan action across Latin America and the Venezuelan diaspora, which has been overwhelmingly positive.

Our preliminary take on this event, as with the Trump tariffs, is that it may have some salutary effects — in this case, striking a long-overdue blow to the communist and globalist conspiracy in the Western Hemisphere — but was not conducted entirely along constitutionalist lines. We hope that the predictions of a Middle East-style quagmire prove incorrect, and that this event redounds to the long-term benefit of our Latin American and Venezuelan friends and allies. We certainly anticipate that, whatever the configuration of interests behind this

Contributors: Gary Benoit • Steve Bonta • Paul Dragu • Christian Gomez

William F. Jasper • John T. Larabell • Alex Newman • Peter Rykowski • Rebecca Terrell • Joe Wolverton II, J.D.

Copyright ©2026 by *The New American*

event, the globalists will try to turn it to their advantage. Hence, vigilance and a wait-and-see attitude are the order of the day. — Steve Bonta

After Venezuela, Who's Next?

As an old sea shanty put it, "Greenland is a dreadful place, a land that's never green, where there's ice and snow, and the whale-fishes blow, and daylight's seldom seen." Few of us are likely ever to see Greenland, except from a passenger jet on its way to Europe or the Middle East. It's a cold, desolate, ice-covered island lying mostly north of the Arctic Circle, with a population of barely 50,000 people. Once, during the Medieval Warm Period, its climate was akin to that of the Orkney Islands. It was settled by Vikings from Iceland, who built villages and churches, herded sheep, and exploited the abundant fisheries and stocks of marine mammals — and then left with the onset of the Little Ice Age. Today, most of its population lives in the capital, Nuuk, and, despite its dependence on Denmark, is still doggedly determined to pursue full independence.

The United States has long had a military presence in Greenland, owing to its strategic location near the Arctic Ocean and North Atlantic shipping lanes. In World War II, the U.S. militarily occupied the island, ousting a small force of Germans. During the Cold War, Greenland hosted numerous U.S. military facilities, including missile early-warning radar stations, and Thule Air Force Base on the northern edge of the island. Today, only Thule remains, albeit as the renamed Pituffik Space Base.

In 1952, Denmark and the United States inked a deal, the Defense of Greenland Agreement, giving the United States essentially blanket permission to place whatever military assets on the island that it deemed necessary, a Cold War-era expedient that has never been discarded. Thus, it would seem that the United States can station whatever military assets it deems necessary on Greenland. Why, then, the push to acquire it as a U.S. territory, by force if necessary?

It's impossible to know how much of Trump's talk is mere bluster, intended to spook the Europeans into acceding to his demands. It is not clear whether alleged Chinese or Russian presence in or around Greenland is

worrisome enough to warrant some type of preemptive military action. What is clear is that Greenland, unlike Venezuela, has not allied itself with America's enemies, stolen American assets, shipped drugs and criminal illegal immigrants into America, or participated in state-sponsored drug trafficking. These facts alone, coupled with Greenland's historic compliance with U.S. military interests, would cast into extreme doubt any pretext — constitutional, Monrovian, or otherwise — for military annexation of Greenland.

Of course, any such action might have the benign consequence of the dissolution of NATO. But that would not excuse the action; the United States is free to withdraw from NATO anytime it wants, without the taint of some kind of Putin-esque invasion and annexation of territory the United States feels entitled to. While we can understand some latitude for political expedience or strategic necessity, America is still a nation of laws and ideals that professes to be a little better than the tawdry realpolitik of the Old World.

As for other countries on the "Who's Next?" list, Colombia's Petro has been in a war of words with Trump, but elections in Colombia later this year may suffice to rid conservative Colombia of that Marxist dictator wannabe. Trump has suggested that Cuba, bereft of Venezuelan oil, may quickly fall under its own weight. And as for Iran, the Iranians themselves, as of this writing, seem to be handling matters with the encouragement of their exiled crown prince and regional support from Israel.

That leaves one option nobody seems to be talking about, but which is, in this writer's view, the most likely

next target: the Panama Canal. The Chinese influence within Panama remains considerable, and it isn't clear that the canal is yet safely removed from Chinese control. Trump favors low-risk, precision actions, as the assassination of Suleimani and the Venezuelan operation attest. Retaking the canal zone from Panama would be relatively simple (compared to a Colombian, Cuban, or Iranian operation), and might actually have the countenance of legitimacy, given the illegal manner in which the handover of the canal was transacted.

Regardless, most of the messes in the world now — Cuba, Venezuela, Iran, and many others — are the fruits of malign policies of the past. Had America been vigilant in the 1950s and prevented the communist takeover in Cuba, we would not now be facing a problem many times worse, with militant Marxism now in control of Brazil, Venezuela, Colombia, and Nicaragua, in addition to Cuba. Had we not allowed the globalists to betray the Shah of Iran back in the 1970s, the world would have been spared decades of Islamist terror in the Middle East and across the globe, including October 7 and possibly 9/11. Trump and his administration appear bent on righting some of the wrongs of the recent past; the question is whether it is worth the price. — Steve Bonta

Thousands of Cuban Communists Propped Up Maduro, Continue Shielding Regime

Thirty-two Cuban "security personnel" were killed during the lightning military raid by U.S. forces to arrest Venezuelan dictator Nicolás Maduro on January 3. Additionally, 23 Venezuelan military service members were reported to have died in the strike. No American casualties have been reported from the operation, which appears to have been flawlessly carried out.

The Madrid-based *El Pais* reported on January 5 that the Cuban government had confirmed the deaths. "As a result of the criminal attack perpetrated by the United States Government against the sister Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, carried out in the early morning of January 3, 2026, 32 Cubans lost their lives in combat action as they were fulfilling missions representing the Revolutionary Armed Forces and the Ministry of the Interior, at the request of counterpart bodies of the South American country," the Cuban press statement said. According to an Associated Press report, "Among the deceased are colonels, lieutenants, majors and captains, as well as some reserve soldiers, ranging in age from 26 to 60."

Why so many Cuban casualties? Well, the death toll reflects the fact (as confirmed in the Cuban press statement above) that the Maduro regime was completely dominated by the communist Castroite regime in Havana. Although rarely noted in the American "mainstream" media, Fidel Castro began sending thousands of military and intelligence personnel to prop up the faltering communist regime of the late Hugo Chávez decades ago. Venezuelan oil was (and is) the lifeblood of Cuba's economy. That thugs-for-oil arrangement continued under Chávez's successor, Nicolás Maduro. The precise number of Cuban janissaries in Venezuela is not public knowledge, but informed estimates place the total number of Havana's enforcers at somewhere between 5,000 to 10,000, and possibly as many as 30,000 — or more.
(See here, here, here, here, and here.)

The Cuban influence is not likely to diminish under Venezuela's newly inaugurated "president" Delcy Rodriguez, a hardline Marxist who has served in high-level posts in the regimes of both Chávez and Maduro.

She and her brother, Jorge Rodriguez, who currently serves as president of the National Assembly, have been lifelong revolutionaries. Their father, Jorge Antonio Rodriguez, was a founder of the communist-terrorist Socialist League in the 1970s and was infamous for his role in the kidnapping of American businessman William Niehous. Tellingly, Delcy Rodriguez was warmly embraced (literally) and congratulated by the ambassadors of China, Russia, and Iran at her inaugural ceremony. All three countries have been crucial partners of the Chávez-Maduro dictatorship. — William F. Jasper

Bolsonaro: Maduro Capture Is a Severe Blow to São Paulo Forum in Latin America

Brazilian Congressman Eduardo Bolsonaro points out that the capture of Nicolás Maduro will deal a severe blow to the São Paulo Forum, the network of Marxist governments, terrorist organizations, and communist parties that has plagued Latin America with revolutionary activity for decades. In a post on X, he observed that Brazilian dictator Lula da Silva and Colombia's Gustavo Petro will "have terrible days ahead" as a result. The congressman, who is a son of former Brazilian President Jair Bolsonaro, said in his X tweet:

> The Venezuelan regime is the financial, logistical, and symbolic pillar of the São Paulo Forum.
>
> With Maduro captured alive, Lula, Petro, and the others of the São Paulo Forum will now have terrible days ahead, mark my words. Long live freedom!

In January of 2020, we wrote:

> The São Paulo Forum (SPF) was created in São Paulo, Brazil, in 1990, under the official sponsorship of Fidel Castro and Brazil's Communist Workers Party, headed by Lula da Silva, now president of Brazil. Member organizations of the SPF include the Communist Parties of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Puerto Rico, Uruguay, and Venezuela. "Former" terrorist groups that have gone political, such as Nicaragua's Sandinistas and El Salvador's FMLN, are also SPF members. So are organizations that are currently on the U.S. State Department's list of active terrorist groups, such as Colombia's FARC and ELN, the Tupac Amaru of Peru, Chile's MIR, and the Basque ETA of Spain.

In our December 5, 2025 Insider Report story on Zohran Mamdani ("The Mamdani-DSA Comrades: São Paulo Forum Terrorists, Progressive International Communists"), we provide links to multiple stories from *The New American* covering this menagerie of Marxist miscreants (see here, here, here, here, here, and here.)

For *The New American's* video interview with Eduardo Bolsonaro at the 2021 Lindell Cyber Symposium, click here. — William F. Jasper

Massie Sounds the Alarm on Minnesota Childcare Fraud, Venezuelan Intervention, and NATO

In a video interview with *The New American*, Representative Thomas Massie (R-Ky.) delivered a forceful constitutional critique of unconstitutional federal spending, unauthorized foreign intervention, and America's expanding foreign entanglements, warning that the United States is drifting further from the rule of law, the Constitution, and a true America First agenda.

Speaking remotely from his congressional office in Washington, D.C., Massie addressed President Trump's recent remarks to House Republicans, noting growing concerns about internal divisions within the Republican coalition and the president's concerns about Republicans potentially losing the House majority. While Massie shares the president's desire for the GOP to maintain

control of the House, he cautioned that attacks on fellow Republicans, coupled with a failure to keep campaign promises related to foreign policy and the Epstein files, risk fracturing the America First base ahead of the midterm elections, increasing the chances of Republicans losing their majority:

> I think if [President Trump] would spend less time attacking Republicans like Marjorie Taylor Greene or Rand Paul or even myself, and less money from the folks that the consulting class that surrounds him and the donor class that surrounds him, they could use that momentum, that energy, and that money to retain the majority in the midterms…. But the president seemed concerned that he would get impeached if we fall into the minority. And that's almost a certainty, unfortunately. So, I hope we keep the majority. He and I just have different ideas of how to go about that.

Regarding what Republicans should do to retain their majority in House, Massie said:

> I think we should keep our promises. I'm worried that our base is starting to fracture now. There are those who, among MAGA and America First, who feel as I do. We want to prioritize our own country and solve our own problems before we go overseas looking for other problems.

Among domestic problems discussed was the massive fraudulent childcare scandal in Minnesota that was recently widely publicized by YouTuber Nick Shirley. Massie was the only House Republican to vote against the budget resolution last February that appropriated $8 billion in funding to the nationwide childcare assistance program that has since been linked to massive fraud in Minnesota.

According to Shirley's 43-minute-long investigative video report, between $800 million and $1 billion in state and federal taxpayer funds were allegedly funneled through fraudulent Somali-run childcare, non-emergency medical transportation, and personal home-care assistance businesses. Some of those funds might have reached the Al-Shabazz radical Islamic terrorist organization. Massie stressed that even those who believe such federal childcare programs are constitutional should still be alarmed by the lack of oversight. He explained that states such as Minnesota are financially incentivized to allow fraud because federal dollars, whether they are dispersed legitimately or not, stimulate local economies and generate tax revenue for the state.

"The state, the governors and the state legislatures are actually motivated not to have efficient programs, but to have the maximum money that they can get coming to their state," Massie said, "so any time they start cracking down on eligibility, they start restricting the funds, and they think that's a bad thing."

Massie rejects the underlying premise that federal childcare programs are constitutional. He pointed out that such programs did not exist until the 1990s and have no basis in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution. He also criticized the incentives that such programs create, including discouraging marriage, favoring dual-income households for tax purposes, and excluding parents and grandparents who provide care outside the formal workforce. "Everyone is upset about fraud," Massie remarked, "without considering that maybe the whole program itself is fraudulent in itself."

The Kentucky congressman was equally blunt in his assessment of the recent U.S. military intervention in Venezuela to arrest the country's sitting president, albeit a socialist dictator, Nicolás Maduro. Massie characterized the action as an "act of war" rather than an arrest, warning that it sets a dangerous precedent. "We went and snatched the president of another country so that we can take over their resources. And those

resources ostensibly right now, just include the oil," he said.

According to Massie, abandoning legal and constitutional restraints invites global instability. If the United States claims the right to remove foreign leaders based on its own laws, other nations could adopt the same rationale. He criticized those quick to cheer on the Trump administration's military actions, warning that such intervention could embolden Russia, China, or other powers to justify aggression against their neighbors, including Taiwan:

> We've got social-media influencers and even people in the administration that are skipping all of the legal arguments and just saying that "might makes right," that if you can get away with it, then you should be able to do it. And if that's going to be the rationalization going forward, then of course Russia could do this to its lesser neighbors, and China could do this to its lesser neighbors.

"His crime is noncompliance with whatever the United States wants," Massie said of Maduro. "And that would be part of the indictment if the indictment were really written out. Instead, they've indicted him for possessing machine guns in contravention of the 1934 National Firearms Act of the United States."

According to Massie, the real reasons for going after Maduro and Venezuela include Venezuela competing with the U.S. oil industry, producing gold, and using foreign currencies other than the dollar for oil transactions.

Massie warned of what he described as "neocon principles … ascendent in the White House." He elaborated, "In the Cabinet you've got Cabinet members that used to be Never Trumpers because Trump pursued and campaigned on the principle of America First, but now they're in the Cabinet and they've swayed his way of thinking." He also expressed concern about the president being emboldened to conduct further foreign military interventions. "There were injuries, and there were maybe 40 or 80 deaths in Venezuela, but not of our service members," he said, "so they'll use this to ratchet it up next time and put our soldiers at risk again, which I think is wrong."

Also discussed during the interview was Massie's bill H.R. 6508, the Not A Trusted Organization (NATO) Act, to withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in favor of constitutional, bilateral defense agreements to protect the American homeland. "We should not be subsidizing the socialist levels of government spending that they have in Europe by providing for their defense," he said. "And to the extent that people want to interpret Article Five [of the North Atlantic Treaty] wrongly as a suicide pact with Europe against the Soviet Union or China, it would get us out of that suicide pact that's outside of our Constitution. So let's get out of it."

"NATO is a Cold War relic, Massie added. "When the Soviet Union went away, so should our involvement within NATO have gone away."

The full interview may be viewed at TheNewAmerican.com. — Christian Gomez

Illinois Appropriates $1 Million to "Reimagine Capitalism"

America's long-term slide toward full-blown socialism is not confined to New York City under Mayor Zohran Mamdani. In its 2026 state budget, Illinois has appropriated more than $1 million toward initiatives that blatantly undermine America's traditional free-market principles.

According to the Illinois Policy Institute:

> Illinois faces low economic growth, high debt and ballooning pensions — all because state lawmakers are taking ever-more from taxpayers and driving out jobs and working families. Lawmakers claimed the 2026 budget contained no pork, but a closer look shows 2,815 items over $200,000 lawmakers decided to fund in the final hours of the legislative session — rushed, harmful to taxpayers and with no time for public scrutiny….
>
> They also include the Reimagining Capitalism in Illinois Lab, which aims to "change the narrative about who has an ownership claim to American prosperity" and supports wealth redistribution policies. The lab is housed under the Chicago Federation of Labor.
>
> Its primary policy proposal, which its director, Brian Johnson, has written on, is the "citizen dividend," a 5% tax on all business profits redistributed to every American citizen. If implemented at the state level in Illinois, the program would yield just $216 per resident — doing hardly anything to fix inequality and likely pushing more businesses to flee the state.
>
> The budget also handed an $827,000 grant for a guaranteed income pilot program, with no details or justification. However, a recent pilot program in Illinois resulted in recipients' individual income, excluding program payments, falling by $1,800 per year and labor force participation declining by 3.9 percentage points, according to research from the National Bureau of Economic Research from 2024.

Although including wasteful earmarks in a state budget is itself inappropriate, using them to fund socialist programs is particularly egregious.

Additionally, these earmarks illustrate how far many elected officials have drifted from America's founding principles of individual freedom and limited government. However, the actions of elected officials merely reflect their own voters. If voters are not informed about America's founding principles (or oppose those principles), their elected representatives will mirror that lack of understanding or constitutional adherence.

Educate your fellow citizens about America's founding principles, particularly how they ought to be applied in state governments. Also contact and meet with your state legislators, and urge them to enact legislation that reins in the size and scope of state government. — Peter Rykowski

Trump Administration Cuts Federal Regulations in 2025

According to a new analysis, the Trump administration significantly cut the pace of federal rulemaking in 2025, a first step toward limiting the unconstitutional reach of the federal government.

Clyde Wayne Crews of the Competitive Enterprise Institute reports:

> While Biden's 2024 *Federal Register* totaled 106,109 pages — the highest in history — the 2025 volume closed the year with "only" 61,461 pages (adjusted for blanks and skips), the lowest seen since Trump's first-term tally of 61,067. Both are levels otherwise not seen since 1993. Notably, 7,648 of those pages are attributable to Biden-era activity before Trump's inauguration.

Commenting on Crews' report, J.D. Tuccille of *Reason* emphasizes the significance of this statistic:

> True, the Federal Register is only a rough count of regulatory activity; there are other ways the government imposes red tape on the population. Also, the Administrative Procedure Act requires that a rule be issued to repeal a preexisting rule. Theoretically, you could fatten up the Federal Register with nothing but rule rescissions. But the page count is a good starting point for judging the general direction of regulatory activity.
>
> On that point, Trump offers a real contrast to both his predecessor and his successor in the White House. Prior to the Biden administration, BallotPedia reports, "the Federal Register hit an all-time high of 95,894 pages in 2016" under the presidency of Barack Obama (the Law Librarians Society of Washington D.C. puts it at 97,110 pages). That was the first time it exceeded 90,000 pages. The Biden administration broke a new barrier when it exceeded 100,000 pages in 2024. Of course, the rules those pages represent, offset by whatever "unrules" (delays and rescission) are mixed in, accumulate year after year.

Although the number of *Federal Register* pages is revealing, it does not necessarily give the full picture. Crews provides some additional statistics that better reveal the extent of the Trump administration's deregulatory activity:

> Final rule counts cratered to 2,441 in 2025. That is not only substantially down from Biden's 3,248 in 2024, it is the lowest total since recordkeeping began in the mid-1970s. Trump bested his own first-term low-water mark of 2,964 rules in 2019.
>
> Moreover, Trump's "net" total is considerably lower still, as 243 of 2025's rules are attributable to Biden, and a substantial share of Trump's own issuances consist of "Unrules" in the form of delays and rescissions….
>
> Of the rules finalized in 2025, 155 were deemed "significant" by agencies or the Office of Management and Budget, with "Unrules" included among them. This shift is reflected in the administration's recent claims to have finalized 646 deregulatory actions while adding only five significant ones, for a ratio of 129 rules out for every rule added.
>
> Of 2025's 2,441 rules, 597 are acknowledged to affect small businesses, compared with 770 in 2024 — again with delays and rollbacks prominent. Thirty small-business rules are classified as significant….
>
> Meanwhile, federal agencies proposed 1,498 new rules, compared with more than 2,000 during each Obama year. Proposed rules under Trump tend not to be major new regulatory initiatives but repeals, notably of environmental and energy rules.

As an example of these regulatory rollbacks, the White House on Wednesday announced that the Council on Environmental Quality issued a rule to repeal draconian federal permitting regulations dating back to the 1970s.

Although Crews applauds the Trump administration's efforts to rein in federal rulemaking and rescind existing regulations, he warns, "The real test ahead is whether deregulation will be made durable by Congress or be left to the whims of the executive officeholder."

This point is important. If Congress does not act, a subsequent president could completely reverse the Trump administration's deregulatory actions. Accordingly, Congress must enact legislation that ensures deregulation continues — and accelerates.

Do you know how your reps voted on key issues?
View and PRINT Our Scorecards
FREEDOMINDEX
https://thefreedomindex.org
HOW DID YOUR LEGISLATORS VOTE?
Order Online: www.ShopJBS.org or call 1-800-342-6401
ShopJBS.org

A good place for Congress to start is to repeal the Administrative Procedure Act, a 1946 law that entrenched the unconstitutional federal administrative state and enabled its further expansion. As James Madison affirmed in *The Federalist*, No. 45, the federal government's powers under the U.S. Constitution are "few and defined." Under the modern administrative state, however, the federal government has enormously exceeded those limitations.

Contact your U.S. representative and senators, and urge them to introduce and enact strong legislation to completely abolish the administrative state. Additionally, contact your state legislators, and urge them to abolish their state-level equivalents and restore constitutional state government. — Peter Rykowski

DHS Admits REAL ID Unreliable for Verifying Citizenship

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) admitted in a recent court filing that REAL ID is unreliable for confirming U.S. citizenship, citing varying state laws on issuing REAL IDs to non-citizens. This disclosure came to light through a civil rights lawsuit filed by Leo Garcia Venegas with the Institute for Justice. Venegas, a U.S. citizen, was detained multiple times in 2025 during warrantless immigration raids.

DHS officers disregarded Venegas' Alabama REAL ID, and detained him until further verification, stating DHS "needed to further verify his U.S. citizenship because each state has its own REAL ID compliance laws, which may provide for the issuance of a REAL ID to an alien and therefore based on HSI Special Agent training and experience, REAL ID can be unreliable to confirm U.S. citizenship."

Enacted in 2005 under President George W. Bush and introduced by former Representative Jim Sensenbrenner (R-Wis.), who also authored the Patriot Act, REAL ID mandates federal standards for state IDs, effectively creating a de facto national identification database. Enforcement was delayed several times, and eventually began under DHS Secretary Kristi Noem on May 7, 2025, prohibiting Americans with non-compliant IDs from boarding flights and entering federal buildings.

Critics argue REAL ID exceeds congressional authority under Article I, Section 8, violating the 10th Amendment by usurping state powers over the issuing authority for driver's licenses. At least 25 states initially resisted, but federal funding threats coerced compliance. This federal overreach prioritizes Deep State surveillance over individual privacy and state sovereignty. Former Representative Ron Paul (R-Texas) called it a mandatory national ID:

> With the utmost sincerity and the deep conviction, I am quite confident that this bill, if you vote for it you will be voting for a national ID card. And I know some will argue against that, and they say this is voluntary, but it really can't be voluntary if a state opts out nobody's going to accept their driver's license, so this is not voluntary.

The federal government lacks authority to impose a national identification system, and its lack of reliability

only highlights the threat to privacy and freedom. This disclosure undermines the DHS security claims used to justify the REAL ID requirements. If REAL ID cannot reliably confirm citizenship, which the agency now admits, its value for national security, election integrity, or fraud prevention is nonexistent. Americans must urge Congress to repeal the Real ID Act of 2005, and nullify enforcement at the state level. — D. Michael DeRidder

Eliminate Waste in the Federal Childcare Program? Why not End the Program Entirely?

The massive scandal involving federally subsidized Somali childcare centers in Minneapolis has garnered plenty of headlines since a video exposing the corruption by independent journalist Nick Shirley went viral. The sheer size of the scandal has sent shockwaves across the country and provoked calls for ending the fraud and abuse, as well as for investigating and prosecuting those responsible.

Of course, the more fraud and abuse that can be eliminated, the better. But can fraud in federal programs be eliminated completely? And even if the fraud could be eliminated, is efficient socialism really a good solution for helping families truly in need?

If the federal government were not involved in childcare, then fraud in federal childcare programs would be nonexistent. Moreover, the removal of the federal government from childcare would mean that whatever taxpayer money is raised and spent for this purpose would be closer to home, where there would be a better understanding of what's truly needed and how the money is actually being spent, resulting in less waste.

In a December 30 post on X, Representative Thomas Massie (R-Ky.) questioned the federal government's involvement in childcare:

> The fraud in MN is insane and should be prosecuted, but I have questions:
>
> When did it become the federal government's role to provide daycare?
>
> Can grandmas get payments if they care for grandkids? why not?
>
> Do moms who work at home or on a farm qualify for this assistance?

In another December 30 X post, Massie also predicted that the GOP leadership will continue the childcare funding "without a fix":

> On January 30th, funding for the fraudulent daycare programs in MN expires.
>
> It's an $8 billion nationwide program without guardrails to prevent theft. I challenge my colleagues to eliminate the fraud, but I suspect @SpeakerJohnson and @LeaderJohnThune will fund it without a fix.

The true fix is to kill the $8 billion program. For this reason, in the current debate about fraud and abuse in federally subsidized childcare, getting the federal government out of the childcare industry should be getting a lot more attention. — Gary Benoit

Warm Collectivism? Talk About an Oxymoron!

In his January 1 Inaugural Address, New York City Mayor Zohran Mamdani enthused, "We will replace the frigidity of rugged individualism with the warmth of collectivism."

Let that sink in:

"The frigidity of rugged individualism"; and

"The warmth of collectivism"!

The United States of America under our priceless Constitution became the greatest experiment in liberty the world has ever seen because of the rugged individualism of a moral and informed people. Under the Constitution, the national government was limited to a few specified powers, and the people were able to produce untold wealth in the exhilarating atmosphere of freedom. Because of what individualism in a free and just society can and has accomplished for the benefit of mankind, "rugged individualism" has aways had a good connotation, at least for those of us who believe in standing on our own two feet and pursuing our dreams through our own hard work and diligence. Frigid is exactly what rugged individualism is not.

However, what should give us chills is the horrors of collectivism. So-called warm collectivism is an oxymoron if there ever was one, and it makes no more sense than dry water. Collectivism has killed more than 100 million human beings in the last century. Collectivism is, as George Orwell described it in his dystopian novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, "a boot stamping on a human face — forever."

The fact that Mamdani advocates replacing "the frigidity of rugged individualism with the warmth of collectivism" shows how committed and doctrinaire a democratic socialist he actually is. The fact that he apparently believes he can make such an outrageous statement to his New York City constituency in his Inaugural Address without suffering major backlash speaks volumes about how beguiled that constituency has become. After all, if full-blown collectivism were imposed in New York City, almost all New Yorkers would soon become the victims of the powerful few who manipulate the levers of power — and stamp on the human face. They would learn the hard way that socialism is not a share-the-wealth program but a control-the-wealth program; and that a government powerful enough to give the people everything they want is also powerful enough to take from the people everything they have.

In the meantime, while the would-be collectivists are still using "democracy" as a tool for acquiring power, why shouldn't Mamdani feel sufficiently emboldened to embrace collectivism so brazenly in his Inaugural Address? He has made strong statements in the past in support of his socialist beliefs — and despite being so open about those beliefs, he was still easily able to win the mayoral race in the largest city in, and the financial center of, the United States.

As alarming as Mamdani's election may be, however, we must keep in mind that nobody wants to be enslaved. Voters are instead beguiled into slavery. Such was the case when the German people voted the National Socialists (Nazis) into power. And such will be the case in America in the not-too-distant future if enough of us who do know what's going on (and millions of us do know!) fail to awaken, involve, and organize enough of our fellow citizens to reverse America's downward drift into collectivism. Creating that informed citizenry through concerted action is the program of The John Birch Society, the parent organization of *The New American*. — Gary Benoit

NYMHM: News You May Have Missed

MAGA Voices Change Their Tune After Venezuela Raid. Greenwald: War Propaganda Works

Mamdani's "Tenant Advocate" Wrote in 2018, "Impoverish the 'White' Middle Class"

Did Trump's Nigeria Strikes Really Curtail Christian Persecution?

Gen. Michael Flynn Asks Trump to Hold the Deep State Accountable in 2026

MTG Pushes a "Tax Revolt" in 2026 Over Fraud, Foreign Wars. Have Americans Finally Had Enough?

[END]